

**Minutes  
Landmarks Commission Meeting  
October 12, 2016  
4:30pm**

Chair O'Connor called the meeting of the Monona Landmarks Commission to order at 4:30pm.

Present: Chair Mary O'Connor, Mr. Rick Bernstein, Ms. Rebecca Holmquist, Mr. Matt Aro, Ms. Branda Weix

Also present: City Planner & Economic Development Director Sonja Reichertz

**Approval of Minutes**

A motion by Ms. Weix, seconded by Mr. Bernstein, to approve the minutes of August 17, 2016 carried without corrections.

**Unfinished Business**

**A. Commissioner Updates on Additions to the Wisconsin Historical Society Architectural Survey Database and WVMO Radio Recordings.**

Mr. Aro recorded his reading. Chair O'Connor will check with John Disch about recording the Monona Motors / Ernie's Trading Post reading. Chair O'Connor also recorded a spot on the radio advertising that books are available for sale, and Reichertz added it to the City newsletter. There were no updates on the WHS Architectural Survey Database.

**New Business**

**A. Review of Draft Report from Architectural Historian Charles Quagliana Regarding Restoration Options for the Springhaven Pagoda.**

Ms. Holmquist arrived.

The Commission reviewed a draft report prepared by Charles Quagliana dated 10/7/2016 and provided input and recommendations for changes. Staff will gather information on old photos, share the plan with the Parks Director, check the date of the MMSD Utility Line, and combine the reports. Mr. Aro volunteered to draw details of the roof to help with developing a mold for the replacement of the roof. The Commission will discuss fundraising efforts at a future date, once the method of preservation is chosen.

The Commission requested that Mr. Quagliana make some edits to the draft report including:

- The date of construction is more specifically the 1890s, not the mid-to-late 1800s.
- Can Mr. Quagliana provide names or recommendations of concrete companies, both on the expert side and the more traditional concrete companies so the Landmarks Commission can get quotes?
- Ask for a more formal recommendation on the enclosure. If he thinks it should be done, then maybe Public Works can build one. A plywood box could invite more vandals than there currently are.
- Does he recommend the mortar in the foundation stones be repaired? Please be more specific in report.
- Can he provide more information on who does the laser scanning and how much this would cost?
- Can the process for repair and / or replacement be more technically laid out in the report (i.e. if replacing the roof, they would need to saw cut the existing, etc.)
- Can the structural engineer provide a more formal statement about the structure's stability, foundations, columns, and ability to hold a new roof? Can the structural engineer include technical

comments about how the steel would need to be added to a new roof, and how the columns would need to be braced during construction?

- On page 3 of the report, he wrote that repair is preferable to replacement. Please have him clarify. Is this a recommendation or general statement? It seems that he thought replacement was a good option in this case. Similarly, on page 13, the last paragraph implies that preservation is the best course of action.
- Please add the structural engineer's sketches.
- On page 5 is discussion about replacing the parging on top of the foundation wall. Can he be more specific about if this is something that is recommended?
- Can he be more specific in whether he recommends cleaning out the interior basin and how the stones should be replaced if we do?

Overall, the Commission would like to see more technical direction and recommendations in the report. Staff will work with Mr. Quagliana and bring a final draft back to the Commission to guide decisions on next steps.

#### **B. Review of Draft Form for Landmark Site/Building Nomination.**

Reichertz summarized that the Commission suggested developing a form for the following reasons: (1) allows the public to complete a form to nominate a landmark for Commission review, (2) provide a consistent framework for nominating all future landmarks (each form would include the same information and require justification for nomination of the landmark), (3) allow better record keeping of why landmarks were nominated over time, and (4) serve as a useful tool for communicating to the Council as landmarks are nominated in the future. Mr. Aro asked if section number five should say "designation" or "design." He said it should be consistent with the ordinance. The Commission agreed it should say "designation." The Commission agreed the rest of the form was fine and that it should be voted on at the next meeting as a package with the revised ordinance.

#### **C. Review of Current Historic Conservation Ordinance.**

Reichertz shared the existing Historic Conservation Ordinances, Section 13-1-61 of the Zoning Code. The Landmarks Commission made modifications to the Ordinance earlier in 2016 that were approved by Council and the Plan Commission which added some procedures relating to proposed demolition of a landmark, as well as specifying the criteria for designation of a landmark.

At the last meeting, the Commission requested codification of procedures for nomination of a landmark. Reichertz drafted changes based on the City of Madison process. The changes are summarized as follows. Any person may nominate a landmark by submitting a form, as drafted by the Landmarks Commission, to the City Planner to document why it qualifies according to the designation criteria. Next the Landmarks Commission would hold a public hearing, noticed by a Class II publication in the newspaper, and a mailing to the property owner on record and properties within 200' of the proposed landmark property. The Landmarks Commission then completes a report to the Council with a recommendation supporting or opposing the proposed landmark designation. The Council then reviews the Landmarks report and votes to designate or decline to designate the landmark. If designated, the ordinance would require it to be recorded at the Dane County Register of Deeds. Additionally, the ordinance specifies that additional restrictions may be placed on the property only by a voluntary agreement between the Commission and the Owner approved by Council. The ordinance requires the Landmarks Commission to fix a plaque to the site after designation for recognition. A designation may be removed at any time by filing a petition to amend the designation.

Reichertz added that the wording of the designation criteria was modified slightly to make it less wordy.

The Commission clarified that the Class II notice and the public hearing mailings should occur prior to the public hearing held by the Landmarks Commission. Mr. Bernstein also said we should check on any recent state law changes regarding public hearing requirements for historic properties.

There was consensus that the new procedures for nomination of landmarks are appropriate in general with modifications as noted.

Mr. Aro reviewed the process from the existing ordinance regarding Plan Commission involvement in “determination of effect on proposed use or improvement.” There was discussion of why the Plan Commission is involved in the review process. Staff stated it was written that way in the code previously and has not been changed. Staff clarified that the Landmarks Commission is a stand-alone Commission and is not a sub-committee of the Plan Commission. Staff also added that the Historic Conservation Ordinance is part of the zoning code, so any changes require Plan Commission recommendation to Council, however, she does not believe the Plan Commission is required to be part of the review process. The Commission asked staff to write an ordinance where the Landmarks Commission has review authority without the added step of going to Plan Commission, followed by recommendation to Council in order to be consistent with the process for nominating a landmark as drafted for this meeting.

Mr. Aro also pointed out the Plan Commission role under the existing ordinance section for “action on permit application.” The Commission was concerned with the phrasing that states, “*if* the Plan Commission deems it appropriate, it shall refer the application to Common Council for consideration of acquisition or preservation of the landmark or landmark site.” The Commission felt it appropriate for the Landmarks Commission to deem whether or not to refer an application for alterations to a landmark to the Council instead of the Plan Commission.

Chair O’Connor asked staff to review these sections with the City Attorney.

The Commission reviewed the timing and asked that staff include this in the recodification review by the Council this fall.

Ms. Weix left the meeting; a quorum of members still remained.

**D. Commission Recommendations for New Members (2 Vacant Positions)**

Anne Wellman has submitted an application. She lives in the Lambole Cottage on Winnequah, a landmark property. The Commission agreed to recommend her appointment to the Mayor. The Commission said they would reach out to other potential members, and that someone with building experience would be desirable.

**E. Discussion of Items for Future Agenda.**

The next agenda will be similar to this one. The other outstanding project is regarding the previous discussion of an archaeological project which will be revisited in the future.

**Upcoming Meetings**

The next meeting will be November 16, 2016.

**Adjournment**

A motion by Mr. Holmquist, seconded by Mr. Bernstein to adjourn was carried. (5:45 pm)

Respectfully submitted by: Sonja Reichertz, City Planner